

Summary of telephone Interview

December 8, 2009

The following persons participated in the telephone interview with Examiner Dr. Brandon Fetterolf as representatives of the inventors for Patent Application Serial No. 10/768996 :

Suresh C. Srivastava – First Named inventor; Indu M. Anand – Attorney of Record; and, Attorney Ramasamy M. Mannan.

The interview was requested by the inventors seeking clarification of the claim objections stated in the Advisory Action mailed on October 27, 2009, and to resolve some questions before filing the Notice of Appeal and the response to the Advisory Action.

The inventors propose to amend the claims appropriately to obviate the objections in keeping with the Examiner's explanation.

The questions had persisted about the concerns raised in the office action of July 20, 2009: The number of species within the "genus" represented by the generic claim is too vast to be covered by the disclosure.

As to this question, the applicants explained that the previous claim amendment had attempted to address the issue of number of species *vis-a-vis* the genus, since the present invention may be practiced analogously for any of the antimetabolite species. While in agreement with this position, the Examiner suggested that in order to satisfy the written description requirement, the applicants present further arguments and evidence to show that they were in possession of the invention as of the filing date.

Summary of telephone Interview

December 8, 2009

The following persons participated in the telephone interview with Examiner Dr. Brandon Fetterolf as representatives of the inventors for Patent Application Serial No. 10/768996 :

Suresh C. Srivastava – First Named inventor; Indu M. Anand – Attorney of Record; and, Attorney Ramasamy M. Mannan.

The interview was requested by the inventors seeking clarification of the claim objections stated in the Advisory Action mailed on October 27, 2009, and to resolve some questions before filing the Notice of Appeal and the response to the Advisory Action.

The inventors propose to amend the claims appropriately to obviate the objections in keeping with the Examiner's explanation.

The questions had persisted about the concerns raised in the office action of July 20, 2009: The number of species within the "genus" represented by the generic claim is too vast to be covered by the disclosure.

As to this question, the applicants explained that the previous claim amendment had attempted to address the issue of number of species *vis-a-vis* the genus, since the present invention may be practiced analogously for any of the antimetabolite species. While in agreement with this position, the Examiner suggested that in order to satisfy the written description requirement, the applicants present further arguments and evidence to show that they were in possession of the invention as of the filing date.